

	Document		Question		Answer		Changes made (y) or (n)
1	Product Description, Appendix B		Regarding elimination of the 9mm requirement in appendix B, it seems the FAT has two purposes, but could this please be clarified?		The 9mm Resistance to Penetration (RTP) requirement exists as detailed in Purchase Description AR/PD 14-01. 9mm Ballistic Transient Deformation (BTD) is no longer an accept/reject criteria, but will be measured and recorded for Government reference during each 9mm RTP shot. It is unclear what two purposes are being referenced in this question. The purpose of First Article Test (FAT) is to qualify the helmet design for production. Appendix B details the intended calculations to be conducted to review BTD performance for Government reference.		N
1a	Product Description		First, what is the reason for checking on statistical differences between test conditions?		In order to conduct a valid statistical analysis, data from statistically different distributions cannot be aggregated. Checking the difference in BTD performance across test conditions allows for aggregation and examination of the largest statistically allowable sample size without introducing data from different distributions.		N
1b	Product Description		Second, given the “baseline BTD performance” established during FAT, what is the stability measurement approach during LAT?		See response under Question 1d		N
1c	Product Description		How is the comparison done statistically?		See response under Question 1d		N
1d	Product Description		How would the check for statistical difference be done and over what sample size?		Combined answer for 1.b-d.: BTD performance will be measured during FAT and LAT for Government reference. It will not be used as an accept/reject criteria. The Government intends to use this data to document BTD performance of the ACH Gen II. Exact calculations may vary depending on the specific goals of different analyses. One possibility is to conduct a rolling Upper Tolerance Limit (UTL) of the last 48 shots of the same helmet size, to mirror the analysis in FAT. However, the Government may use this data for other analyses as necessary for understanding the performance of the ACH Gen II.		N
2	RFP, Section M		In reference to evaluation for integration/compatibility (table 12, technical sub-factor 4), testing against NVG type III is required. How are these to be checked against a 3 hole system if a 3 hole system does not exist? Only NVG type I and II are listed in the PD.		ACH NVG (Type III – Three Hole Configuration) low profile shroud was removed from the evaluation criteria, Section M, of the RFP as of Amendment 02.		Y - see updated Section M of the RFP
3	RFP		Basis of award notes that weight is significantly more important than price and represents the best value to the Government in a trade-off with price. What is the expected trade-off percentage or ratio?		The RFP intentionally did not include a specific percentage or ratio assignment to the execution of a trade-off determination. Based upon the comprehensive evaluation of all stated evaluation criteria in accordance with their stated relative order of importance, the Government will make a final award decision based on which offer represents the best value to the Government. Based on the best value trade-off analysis, its possible award can go to the lowest priced offero		N